

4-10-2006

University of Northern Iowa Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes, April 10, 2006

University of Northern Iowa. Faculty Senate.

Let us know how access to this document benefits you

Copyright ©2006 Faculty Senate, University of Northern Iowa

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.uni.edu/facsenate_documents



Part of the [Higher Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

University of Northern Iowa. Faculty Senate., "University of Northern Iowa Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes, April 10, 2006" (2006). *Documents - Faculty Senate*. 945.

https://scholarworks.uni.edu/facsenate_documents/945

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Senate at UNI ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Documents - Faculty Senate by an authorized administrator of UNI ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@uni.edu.

SUMMARY OF FACULTY SENATE MEETING 4/10/06

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Bankston called the meeting to order at 3:20 P.M.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Motion to approve the minutes of the 3/27/06 meeting by Senator Strauss; second by Senator Herndon. Motion passed.

CALL FOR PRESS IDENTIFICATION

No press present.

COMMENTS FROM INTERIM PROVOST LUBKER

COMMENTS FROM FACULTY CHAIR, SUE JOSLYN

Faculty Chair Joslyn stated that she sent out an informational e-mail to all faculty on a presentation that Scott Cawelti, English, made over the weekend on academic freedom and responsibilities.

She noted that the Plagiarism Group had their final meeting last Friday and made recommendations to continue this work. They also proposed a faculty code of ethics. There is currently a section included in the UNI Policy and Procedures Manual but it could be looked at and updated if needed.

Francis Degnin, Philosophy and Religion, and Donna Vinton, Academic Assessment, are working on a plagiarism tutorial that will somehow be tied into student registration.

Faculty Chair Joslyn reported that there are currently 30 instructors using Turnitin.com and she will be sending out an email to faculty the last week of classes to remind them how to log in if they want to review it over the summer prior to the start of fall semester.

Faculty Chair Joslyn also noted that the Academic Rigor discussion group will hold it's last meeting Friday, April 14 at noon.

Motion to move into Executive Session by Senator Heston; second by Senator Strauss. Motion passed.

Motion by Senator Soneson to endorse the Regents Faculty Excellence Award Committee's recommendations; second by Senator Heston. Motion passed.

COMMENTS FROM CHAIR, RONNIE BANKSTON

Chair Bankston stated that the Senate was initially informed about the Multi-Modal facility last April and he has requested an update be provided that at the April 24 meeting.

CONSIDERATION OF CALENDAR ITMES FOR DOCKETING

906 Report to the Faculty Senate - Honor Code Task Force

Motion to docket in regular order as item #816 by Senator Strauss; second by Senator Tallakson. Motion passed.

NEW BUSINESS

Senators Strauss and Licari volunteered to serve on the University Parking Committee.

ONGOING BUSINESS

Operalization of CETL Recommendations

Chair Bankston noted that this had been tabled at the last senate meeting.

Motion to bring it off the table by Senator Heston; second by Senator Soneson. Motion passed.

Chair Bankston stated that the Senate asked Senator Heston to provide information about the group of individuals that have

shown ongoing interest in mentoring and the Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning (CETL).

Senator Heston defined the Teaching-Learning Consortium as an informal group of faculty and staff interested in re-establishing the CETL and discussed what they hope to accomplish. She noted that the group has no wish to take on a formal charge from the Faculty Senate and that they plan to hold informal discussions and activities centered on teaching and learning excellence. A lengthy discussion followed with Senator Heston answering questions.

Motion by Senator Soneson for the Faculty Senate to applaud the efforts of the informal Teaching-Learning Consortium group, to wish it well, and to report back to the Senate with periodic reports; second by Senator O'Kane. Motion passed.

An amended motion was made by Senator Licari that the Faculty Senate prioritize the third recommendation in the CETL Task Force report about having a discussion on teaching excellence at UNI and address the recommendation at the Faculty Senate's fall retreat; second by Senator Heston. Motion passed.

CONSIDERATION OF DOCKETED ITEMS

814 Emeritus Status request, Jerry D. Stockdale, Department of Sociology, Anthropology and Criminology, effective 12/05

Motion to approve by Senator Soneson; second by Senator VanWormer. Motion passed.

815 Annual Report of the Committee on Admission, Readmission and Retention

Doug Koschmeder, UNI's Associate Registrar, was present to discuss the report with the Senate and to answer questions.

Motion to receive the report by Senator Heston; second by Senator Soneson. Motion passed.

ADJOURNMENT

DRAFT FOR SENATOR'S REVIEW

MINUTES OF THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE MEETING
4/10/06
1634

PRESENT: Ronnie Bankston, Maria Basom, Cindy Herndon, Melissa Heston, Rob Hitlan, Sue Joslyn, Shashi Kaparathi, Michael Licari, James Lubker, Steve O'Kane, Phil Patton, Jerome Soneson, Laura Strauss, Denise Tallakson, Donna Vinton, Barb Weeg, Katherine VanWormer

Absent: David Christensen, Paul Gray, Susan Koch, Atul Mitra, Pierre-Damien Mvuyekure

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Bankston called the meeting to order at 3:20 P.M.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Motion to approve the minutes of the 3/27/06 meeting by Senator Strauss; second by Senator Herndon. Motion passed.

CALL FOR PRESS IDENTIFICATION

No press present.

COMMENTS FROM INTERIM PROVOST LUBKER

Interim Provost Lubker updated the Senate on the current budget situation and reviewed the history of how state funding for the Regents institutions had occurred prior to the recent budget crisis. Before the Transformation Plan, there would be two separate requests from each university; a request for an operational budget, which included salary and utility increases, things that were needed to run the institution. The second request was the special appropriations request where we would ask for new lines, new equipment or new programs, special things, and that was the request the administration was usually more nervous about. Last year, under Iowa Board of Regents (BOR) Chair Forsyth, they began what they called the "Transformation Plan." Rather than asking for operational and

special appropriations there was one request from all three Regents universities for \$40 million, which would then be divvied up among the universities with UNI's share being 18.75%. In return, the universities would promise to hold tuition increases at 4% and to re-allocate \$1.00 for every \$2.00 they gave us. If they gave \$40 million, all three universities would re-allocate a total of \$20 million. For two years this plan has not worked well but it is still the plan that is in place.

We hope to have, based on enrollment projections for Fall 2006, \$1.2 million new dollars from tuition.

We will need \$3.6 million to meet salary increases and fringe benefits for faculty. We will need \$1.4 to meet salary increases and fringe benefits for P&S staff, and we will need \$1.6 to meet salary increases and fringe benefits for merit staff, which totals \$6.6 million. We will need \$648,000 to meet increases in utility bills and \$125,000 for the opening of the ITTC. Thus, for the operational side, we'll need a total of 7.373 million in new money.

Interim Provost Lubker continued that it has been reported in the media that the legislature is going to give the universities \$40 million. What that really amounts to is two \$20 million chunks. The first \$20 million will go directly to the universities. Of that, \$11 million will go into our general fund base budget, which is reusable and will return next year to the three universities. The remaining \$9 million of the first \$20 million chunk is one-time money just for the year. Our share of the \$11 million will be \$2.06 million; our share of the \$9 million will be \$1.69 million. The only amount that we can safely use for salary increases is the \$2.06 million but by moving funding around a bit we can probably pull some of that one time money in. But when you do the math, we're only really getting \$11 million, not \$40 million.

The second \$20 million chunk is from the Battelle Fund. This is one time money set. While this money is only for one year, there are indications that we may get it for another year and a half. Of that \$20 million, \$5 million comes off the top to go to the universities to be distributed. We anticipate getting about \$1 million, but again, there are no guarantees. President Koob has suggested that this money be used as transition funding for salaries for faculty and staff but the terms of the Battelle Fund dictate that it be used only for the three economic development areas of the biosciences, information technology, and advanced manufacturing. Other areas such as social and behavioral sciences, humanities and fine arts, and education would not

receive any of these funds. Some of this \$5 million is expected to go to chaired professorships with a dollar-per-dollar cost-share. Interim Provost Lubker did note that this is all just a proposal, at this point. As of this date, no decisions have been made in Des Moines about our budgets.

The remaining \$15 million, he continued, is to be spent on projects approved by the board with advice from an external committee. \$6.8 million of the \$15 million could go to infrastructure expenses. But the overall use of it will be controlled by this external committee, which is comprised of one chair appointed by the governor, three members of the BOR, two members of the Bioscience Alliance, two members from information technology appointed by the governor, and two members from advanced manufacturing also appointed by the governor.

Interim Provost Lubker noted that this accounts for the \$40 million that has been reported in the media, and this is updated information that President Koob wanted to be shared with the Senate.

Senator Soneson noted that as this is an election year, what this means for the budget and how it would affect us. Interim Provost Lubker responded that state officials are not taking any firm stands and are not putting themselves out at all on any issue. Voting on a bill that recently came forward in the house with a \$40 million rider was divided by strict party lines and was defeated.

COMMENTS FROM FACUTY CHAIR, SUE JOSLYN

Faculty Chair Joslyn stated that she just sent out an informational e-mail to all faculty on a presentation that Scott Cawelti, English, made over the weekend which summarizes the responsibilities that go along with academic freedom.

She noted that the Plagiarism Group had their final meeting last Friday and made recommendations to continue this work. One recommendation was that the university focus its efforts for a year with regards to speakers and special programs, on a specific theme such as "The Year of Critical Thinking". This could be tied in with the Faculty Senate Speakers Series that has been discussed. Faculty book discussion groups could be planned along with similar activities to address this specific issue and also relating to academic rigor, plagiarism and ethics.

The Plagiarism group also proposed a faculty code of ethics. There currently is a section in the UNI Policy and Procedures Manual but it could be looked at and updated if needed. In Dr. Cawelti's presentation there is a list of things faculty members should avoid and a list of things faculty members need to do and these could perhaps be incorporated into the manual.

Francis Degnin, Philosophy and Religion, and Donna Vinton, Academic Assessment, are working on a plagiarism tutorial that will somehow be tied into student registration. The proposal is that before a student can register they would have to spend five minutes reading about proper citation and plagiarism, and will then have to confirm that they will not plagiarize before they will be allowed to register.

Faculty Chair Joslyn reported that there are currently 30 instructors that have signed on with Turnitin.com with a total of 414 submissions, 16 having 75-100% matches, 296 in the 1-24% matches, and 70 in the no matches category. She will be sending out an email to faculty the last week of classes to remind them how to log in if they want to review it over the summer prior to the start of fall semester. She noted that the University of Iowa has about 120 faculty members out of about 1400 using the program.

Faculty Chair Joslyn also noted that the Academic Rigor discussion group will hold it's last meeting of the year on Friday, April 14 at noon. All faculty are invited to attend.

Motion to move into Executive Session by Senator Heston; second by Senator Strauss. Motion passed.

Motion by Senator Soneson to endorse the Regents Faculty Excellence Award Committee's recommendations; second by Senator Heston. Motion passed.

COMMENTS FROM CHAIR RONNIE BANKSTON

Chair Bankston stated that the Senate was initially informed about the Multi-Modal facility last April and he has requested an update be provided at the April 24 meeting. He has not yet received confirmation.

CONSIDERATION OF CALENDAR ITEMS FOR DOCKETING

906 Report to the Faculty Senate - Honor Code Task Force

Motion to docket in regular order as item #816 by Senator Strauss; second by Senator Tallakson. Motion passed.

NEW BUSINESS

Chair Bankston reminded the Senate that at the last meeting, David Zarifis, UNI Public Safety Director, extended an invitation for two senators to serve on the University Parking Committee. Senators Strauss and Licari volunteered.

ONGOING BUSINESS

Operalization of CETL Recommendations

Chair Bankston noted that this had been tabled at the last senate meeting.

Motion to bring it off the table by Senator Heston; second by Senator Soneson. Motion passed.

Chair Bankston stated that the Senate asked Senator Heston to provide information about the group of individuals that have shown ongoing interest in mentoring and the Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning (CETL).

Senator Heston distributed a list of interested faculty and staff and minutes from their first meeting. She noted these individuals are volunteering their time and energy to provide some type of professional development related to teaching and learning for colleagues. This group was constructed from the list of people who had indicated on an earlier survey that they would be interested in resurrecting the center and would like to participate. Those participating had showed interest by either writing strongly in favor of the center, and/or responding favorably to an e-mail regarding the resurrection of the center or by participating in the Campus Conversation in February. The list is also divided by College, noting that the majority are from the College of Humanities and Fine Arts (CHFA).

Senator Heston reported that the outcome of the first meeting is documented on the second page of the handout. A number of

strategies were discussed with the biggest idea being that faculty, more than anything, need a centralized place to gather to discuss teaching on an informal basis. There are clear indications that people are interested in having conversations and there are perceptions out there that there is more going on in regards to a center. There is an ongoing organized group, Talking, Teaching and Learning group, that meets every other Friday along with Faculty Chair Joslyn's two groups on plagiarism and academic rigor. Other than those groups, she knows of no other organized activities that are focused on teaching and learning issues on campus at any level.

The people that attended the meeting did not feel as though they wanted to take on a charge from the Senate. They want to do what the group decides to do and if they took on a charge from the senate they might be limited in what they could do. They are also looking for more permanent leadership, as Senator Heston would like to participate in the discussions. Their activities will probably include some book discussions in the fall lead by faculty and possibly tied into other discussions going on on-campus such as plagiarism. The American Democracy Project is trying to organize a faculty seminar on teaching with current events information. The group plans on looking at the space that has been set-aside in the renovated East Gym and try to determine how the scheduling of that space should be addressed. They also plan on revising the information on the UNI website to reflect more accurately what is actually going on and to provide some electronic resources so people can get to other related links in an easier manner.

Senator Herndon asked if the group would be staying together informally. Senator Heston responded that they are committed to carrying out the activities she just discussed and would be approaching the Provost's Office for some funding for some social activities such refreshments for discussion groups. They also might hire a work-study student to update the web page. They are not looking at large amounts of money to do large things.

Senator Heston commented that if the Senate were to offer the Teaching-Learning Consortium group its approval, that would be good but the group is not interested in taking on a Senate charge.

Senator Soneson asked what happened to the space allocated to the old center. Interim Provost Lubker responded that it has been given back to the library and is being used in connection

with the reallocations of space due to the fire in Gilchrist Hall. Senator Soneson asked if there is a chance that the space could be recovered. Interim Provost Lubker responded that that probably would not happen due to the serious needs for space due to the fire. He urged the group to look at the space that will be allocated in the East Gym for the center. Senator Heston noted that that space was designed to be used for such a center and to work in conjunction with the Instructional Technology Center that will be in the building. It has faculty office space, carrels, meeting space, and is designed for a teaching-learning center. There are also classrooms furnished with innovated technology located in the building that would be available.

Chair Bankston thanked Senator Heston for her update.

Chair Bankston stated that this brings the Senator back to the issue of how to operationalize the recommendations outlined in the task force report.

Senator Strauss stated that it was her understanding that what was approved was that the Senate would take another look at this in three years once the new president and provost were hired and in place. As that was what the Senate approved, she has no problem with an informal group working through the next three years. So that when this comes back to the Senate there is something that is faculty driven as opposed to the Senate making a charge.

Senator Heston responded that there were recommendations that did not really have a time frame. The group will address recommendation #2 for an ongoing interdisciplinary faculty discussion but recommendation #3 should be addressed at a university wide discussion on whether teaching excellence still matters. Recommendation #4 dealt with looking more intently at mentoring issues and how equitable those opportunities are or are not across campus. She is pretty confident that this group has no interest in addressing recommendations #3 or #4. She thought that the Senate might want to prioritize the recommendations. An in depth discussion on the importance of teaching and, taking into account the current circumstances here at UNI, would be a first step. Out of that might grow issues about a center or what kind of mentoring should be provided. These kinds of philosophy issues need to come first before we can get into specifics, and the Senate is the logical group to organize these discussions. She also noted that this may be a misperception due to the small sample, that there isn't really

that much concern about the role of teaching. But it would be good to get more data on this and it may vary from department to department within the campus. It is hard to draw any firm conclusions from a sample of 20%. There are faculty out there that are saying that the faculty should know their content and deliver it just for students to learn and worrying about the quality of teaching is irrelevant.

Interim Provost Lubker commented that from his own experience working at four major research universities prior to coming to UNI, teaching, in the best definition of the word, matters more at this university than any place he's ever experienced. Teaching is really what we do here and people that think otherwise may not have worked anywhere else.

Senator Heston replied that part of the perception is that there's been "mission creep"; we were primarily a teaching university and we've become more of a teaching and scholarship university. And there's concern that you can't do both of those things well.

Interim Provost Lubker responded that for him teaching and scholarship go together. You don't have to be a great scholar to be a great teacher but being a great scholar doesn't mean you're not a great teacher.

Senator Strauss asked what the informal group would like to do. Senator Heston responded that they wanted to organize opportunities for faculty to get together such as book discussions. Senator Strauss continued that they appear not to be interested in what a center should be but to carry on activities that might be taken on by a center if one is created.

Senator Heston noted that there are people on the list who might be interested in spearheading an effort to create a center. It is a very diverse group with some wanting a faculty driven center and others wanting a director driven center, and some want a very loosely organized diverse center. Rather than attempting to get everyone on the same course at this point, they're trying to get something up and going forward. If no one comes to the activities they plan then they can re-focus their efforts elsewhere.

Chair Bankston agreed that the informational group would not address all the recommendations contained in the report. He asked the Senate if they should prioritize the recommendations

and address one initially, or try to simultaneously address the recommendations.

Senator Licari responded that he agrees that the campus should first have a conversation about recommendation #3, to what degree teaching excellence really matters. To pursue anything else first doesn't make much sense. He recommends making recommendation #3 the top priority or the next step.

Senator O'Kane noted that that was what he was going to suggest. He asked if there were some way for the Senate to give the Teaching-Learning Consortium group their approval without giving them a charge.

Senator Heston replied that the Senate could say that they appreciate the group's efforts and could ask for informal follow-ups. One of the things that needs to be done is to document both need and interest. The Senate could acknowledge that this group is going forward and that they support it's efforts.

Chair Bankston stated that the Senate applauds the group's commitment to the issue and encourages them to visit the Senate with their findings at a later date.

Senator Herndon commented that some of the initiatives that Faculty Chair Joslyn has undertaken are wonderful but they have taken a considerable amount of time.

Senator Heston stated that there is a plan for a broad general invitation to all faculty saying this is an opportunity if you want to participate. The next meeting will be announced on UNI Online with an open invitation. Hopefully faculty will feel that they have been invited and not pressured to join, and that this is not something that administration is trying to force on the faculty, which is another perception about the center that has been expressed.

Motion by Senator Soneson for the Faculty Senate to applaud the efforts of the informal Teaching-Learning Consortium group, to wish it well, and to report back to the Senate with periodic reports; second by Senator O'Kane. Motion passed.

Chair Bankston noted that the Senate wished Senator Heston and members of the group the best of luck in their endeavors.

Senator Weeg asked if it would assist the group in its work if the Senate would endorse the idea that an invitation should be sent to all faculty, such as an e-mail. Senator Heston noted that if the Provost approves, an e-mail can be sent.

Chair Bankston stated that two members of the Senate have identified the initial step should be a campus wide conversation looking at the value and importance of teaching at UNI.

Motion by Senator Licari to hold a campus conversation on the degree to which teaching excellence matters at UNI and begin to seek ways that we can develop mechanisms to support and reward teaching excellence on campus; second by Senator Strauss.

Senator Soneson asked if, by this motion, we are asking to form a committee to do this and what is the mechanism by which such a proposal is carried out.

Senator Licari responded that this could come out of the informal Teaching-Learning Consortium group, depending on its activities and those faculty that are regularly attending their sessions.

Senator Heston noted that it would be easy to develop a questionnaire asking faculty what they think, on a scale of one to ten, how important is teaching, how important is scholarship, things along those lines. What is not known is what the broad population of faculty really believes. We know what the people on the extremes believe but we don't really know what the people in the middle believe. The only way to do that is to get data and that it is really the administration's responsibility to organize, to have and to summarize those conversations.

Chair Bankston noted that in Mass Communication and Media Studies there is a theory called agenda setting, which basically takes the position that the importance that the media assigns to coverage of a specific issue ultimately influences the public's perception of the issue. If this body feels that this is a significant, critical issue, there is a difference between a survey going out from the informal group and having a conversation or meeting that is sponsored and lead by the Faculty Senate.

Senator Heston suggested that this could be something that the Senate discusses at their fall retreat.

Senator Licari amended his motion; that the Faculty Senate prioritize the third recommendation in the CETL Task Force report about having a discussion on teaching excellence at UNI and address the recommendation at the Faculty Senate's fall retreat. Second by Senator Heston. Motion passed.

CONSIDERATION OF DOCKETED ITEMS

814 Emeritus Status request, Jerry D. Stockdale, Department of Sociology, Anthropology and Criminology, effective 12/05

Motion to approve by Senator Soneson; second by Senator VanWormer.

Senator Soneson noted that he has gotten to know Dr. Stockdale well during his time here at UNI. He teaches Environmental Ethics and Dr. Stockdale taught a similar class and they share a common interest. Dr. Stockdale has had a rich career, teaching at Cornell University prior to coming to UNI. He served as department head and was a well-respected teacher by students and colleagues both.

Motion passed.

815 Annual Report of the Committee on Admission, Readmission and Retention

Doug Koschmeder, UNI's Associate Registrar, was present to discuss the report. Mr. Koschmeder noted that when undergraduate students are academically suspended they are asked to sit out an academic year. The basic function of the committee is to review the requests by students that would like to make an exception to that policy. Students must appear before the committee or ask them to review their exception. The committee is made up of one faculty member from each college, advisors and administrators. The report that was distributed to the senate is an annual report.

Mr. Koschmeder stated that in general, when a student's GPA falls below 2.0 one of three things happens: the student goes on academic warning, academic probation or academic suspension, which is based on a scale. A first semester student could be academically suspended based on deficiency points, grade points, graded hours. He noted Table I indicates the percentage of undergraduate students that are academically suspended. It was

2.05% for fall 2004 and 1.68% for Fall 2005. The reverse trend was true for spring; 1.78% 2004 and 2.03% 2005.

Senator Soneson reiterated that if a student gets below a 2.0 GPA for the semester they are put one of the three categories. Mr. Koschmeder replied that that was true. Senator Soneson noted that 2.0 graded is a "C", and that the administration recognizes that a "C" is not average, that it is well below average. Mr. Koschmeder replied that that was also true.

Mr. Koschmeder noted GPA is broken down into quartiles on Table II. In looking at freshman from 2004 to 2005 for fall there is an increase in all three categories.

Table III he noted, indicates that the number of academic suspensions; 209 for spring 2005, 24 for summer and 184 fall 2005. The majority of those students suspended in fall were new students.

Chair Bankston referred to Table I, warning and probations, noting it appears across time the percentage of students in these categories is decreasing. What variables are influencing this outcome? Mr. Koschmeder responded that one factor that might play into this is that enrollment is going down but other than that he doesn't know.

Senator Soneson asked if it could be that as GPA's rise there are fewer and fewer students below 2.0. Mr. Koschmeder said that might also be a reason. He noted that for the students that want the exception to a year's suspension, the common excuse is "I know I'll do better." The committee then discusses with the student about community colleges being an excellent step between high school and college. Community college enrollments are increasing and maybe more students are recognizing that step before they get to a four-year school and are thus successful at the four-year school.

Senator Hitlan commented that it would be nice to see it broken down by transfer status rather than student rank so the senate could get a better picture of what's going on. Mr. Koschmeder noted that the report does not identify transfer students or new freshmen. He noted that that majority of new students suspended the first semester are new freshman due to the lack of preparation for a four-year school. He can get that information to the senate if there is interest. Senator Hitlan responded that it would be interesting to see those numbers.

In response to Senator Kaparthi's question, Mr. Koschmeder replied that this is based on students' UNI GPA but it can be the total cumulative for transfer students.

Senator Weeg asked if there is a relationship between the credit load and the number of students placed on suspension. Could it be related to the number of courses students were taking in the summer?

Mr. Koschmeder noted that he's not sure but during that time UNI instituted the May academic term. There's a perception with students that summer is going to be easier academically but they don't realize that the same amount of material is covered in a shorter period of time with classes meeting daily and if they fall behind it's difficult to catch up. Approximately five years ago the suspensions guidelines got tougher, going to a scale based on credit hours, which also may come into play.

Chair Bankston asked if a readmitted student's academic progress is tracked during the year? Mr. Koschmeder replied that once a student is readmitted it's under the condition that they get a 2.0 every semester. If they fail to do so, and their cumulative is less than 2.0, they are suspended a second time and the student then needs to consider that as a permanent suspension. In some cases, the committee will make recommendations that the student meet with their advisor periodically who try to do things to help these students to become successful. Other than that, there is no routine monitoring.

Senator Herndon noted that in Table II it appears that juniors and seniors have lower GPA's, and is this significant? Mr. Koschmeder responded that he has no answers to explain that.

Motion to receive the report by Senator Heston; second by Senator Soneson. Motion passed.

Chair Bankston thanked Mr. Koschmeder for sharing this information with the Senate.

ADJOURNMENT

Motion to adjourn by Senator VanWormer; second by Senator Licari. Motion passed.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:30 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Dena Snowden
Faculty Senate Secretary

TO: Professor Ronnie Bankston, Chair
University Faculty Senate

FROM: Douglas D. Koschmeder, Secretary
Committee on Admission, Readmission and Retention

RE: 2005 Committee Annual Report

DATE: March 6, 2006

Attached is the annual report of the Committee on Admission, Readmission and Retention for the calendar year 2005. The report is statistical in nature and is basically similar to previous annual reports submitted to the University Faculty Senate.

Representatives of the Committee will be present at any meeting the Faculty Senate might wish to discuss and ask questions regarding this report. We therefore submit this annual report of the Committee on Admission, Readmission and Retention to the University Faculty Senate. If in the meantime you have questions or suggestions for the presentation of additional information please let us know.

DDK:njr
attachment

COMMITTEE ON ADMISSION, READMISSION AND RETENTION

Explanation of Tables

TABLE I

Academic suspension is for no specific period, but readmission is not usually granted before the student has been out of college for at least one academic year. Students under academic suspension must apply for readmission. Some students may be permitted immediate readmission provided the cause of deficient performance has been removed and successful performance can be assumed. All percents refer to the total undergraduate student body.

Read the first line like this: In the fall semester 1992, 2.2% of the student body began the semester on a warning, at the end of which 0.9% had the warning canceled, 0.7% had it continued, and enough more received warnings to bring the total at the end of the semester to 4.0%. Read the probations the same way.

TABLE II

Grade indices are expressed in quartiles for each undergraduate classification and for all undergraduates.

TABLE III

This table shows the actual number of students placed into the warning, probation, and suspension categories for 2005. It also shows the action taken on applications for readmission for 2005.

TABLE IV

This table shows the achievement of previously suspended students for their first semester after readmission.

TABLE I
PERCENT OF UNDERGRADUATES INVOLVED
IN WARNINGS, PROBATIONS, OR SUSPENSIONS

SEMESTERS	WARNINGS		PROBATIONS		WARNINGS		PROBATIONS		SUSPENSIONS
	Dur Sem	At End of Sem	Dur Sem	At End of Sem	Canc	Cont	Rmvd	Cont	
FALL									
1992	2.2	4.0	3.2	4.2	0.9	0.7	0.9	1.3	1.67
1993	2.2	3.7	2.6	4.2	1.0	0.6	1.0	1.1	1.49
1994	1.8	3.8	2.7	3.5	0.8	0.5	1.0	1.1	2.00
1995	1.9	5.3	2.8	4.7	0.8	0.5	0.8	1.3	1.88
1996	1.9	4.3	2.8	3.9	0.9	0.5	1.0	1.1	1.85
1997	1.7	3.5	2.5	3.6	0.9	0.4	1.0	0.9	1.77
1998	1.1	3.5	2.4	3.8	0.8	0.4	0.8	1.0	1.68
1999	1.7	3.2	2.6	3.8	0.9	0.4	1.0	1.1	1.60
2000	1.5	3.9	2.4	4.0	0.8	0.4	0.8	1.1	1.74
2001	1.6	3.3	2.7	4.1	0.8	0.4	0.9	1.1	1.71
2002	1.7	3.4	2.6	3.4	0.9	0.5	0.8	1.1	1.76
2003	1.6	3.3	2.3	3.4	0.8	0.3	0.9	0.8	2.01
2004	1.6	3.4	2.4	3.6	0.8	0.4	0.9	0.9	2.05
2005	1.4	3.1	2.2	3.6	0.6	0.4	0.9	0.8	1.68
SPRING									
1992	4.1	2.7	4.5	3.9	2.1	1.0	1.2	2.1	1.85
1993	4.0	2.8	4.0	3.6	1.9	1.0	1.0	2.0	1.75
1994	3.5	2.5	4.0	3.6	1.6	1.0	1.0	1.8	1.64
1995	3.7	2.6	3.7	3.6	1.7	1.0	0.9	1.7	1.93
1996	4.2	2.8	4.5	3.5	2.1	1.1	0.6	2.5	1.97
1997	4.2	2.4	3.6	3.5	1.9	1.0	1.0	1.6	1.67
1998	3.4	2.3	3.6	3.2	1.7	0.8	1.1	1.5	1.65
1999	3.5	2.4	3.6	3.4	1.7	0.9	1.2	1.6	1.50
2000	3.2	2.2	3.5	3.2	1.6	0.8	0.9	1.6	1.67

Q3	3.15	3.20	3.25	3.27	3.33	3.28	3.25	3.31	3.27	3.27	3.39
M	2.63	2.67	2.72	2.75	2.77	2.71	2.75	2.76	2.69	2.76	2.85
Q1	2.08	2.09	2.19	2.18	2.19	2.17	2.19	2.22	2.12	2.17	2.27

TABLE III
STUDENT PROBATIONS, WARNINGS, AND SUSPENSIONS

	X	0	2C	3A	3C	8C	9	Total
Spring 2005	125	206	2	110	135	34	209	821
Summer 2005	19	31	0	12	34	22	24	142
Fall 2005	100	338	2	252	89	56	184	1021

ACTIONS ON APPLICATIONS FOR READMISSION
(1/1/2005 through 12/31/2005)

	Readmits*	Denials
Spring 2005	43	20
Summer 2005	8	0
Fall 2005	74	15
TOTALS	125	35

* Includes immediate readmissions

Codes:

X	Removed from academic probation
0	Warning
2C	Continued on probation (transfer probation)
3A	Placed on academic probation
3C	Continued on probation (3A changes to 3C when the student is eligible to return after one semester under 3A)
8C	Probation readmission after suspension

9 Academic suspension

TABLE IV
ACHIEVEMENT OF PREVIOUSLY SUSPENDED STUDENTS FOR THEIR
FIRST SEMESTER AFTER READMISSION

	Spring 05	Summer 05	Fall 05	Yearly Totals
1. Total number readmitted	43	8	74	125
2. Number of readmitted who enrolled	36	6	65	107
3. Percent of enrollees earning less than a 2.00 gpa for the semester	38.9	16.7	32.3	33.6
4. Percent of enrollees earning a semester gpa between 2.00 and 2.50	22.2	50.0	20.0	22.4
5. Percent of enrollees earning a semester gpa between 2.51 and 2.99	27.8	00.0	15.4	18.7
6. Percent of enrollees earning a semester gpa of 3.00 or higher	11.1	33.3	32.3	25.2
7. Percent of total enrollees who earned a semester gpa of 2.00 or higher	61.1	83.3	67.7	67.3
8. Percent of enrollees who were re-suspended after their first returning semester	25.0	00.0	12.3	15.9
9. Number re-suspended after immediate return following suspension	2	0	0	2

Teaching-Learning Consortium
Initial List of Interested Faculty and Staff
April 10, 2006

Attended First Meeting

Bev Kopper (CSBS)
Dale Cyphert (CBA)
Deb Deemer (COE)
Jerry Smith (CBA)
Jean Gerrath (CNS)
Karen Agee (Student Affairs)
Erica Duffy (CHFA)
Phil Fass (CHFA)
Katheryn East (COE)
Marilyn Drury (ITS)

Have Expressed Strong Interest (multiple communications)

Donna Vinton (Student Affairs)
Kim Knesting (COE)
Kent Sandstrom (CSBS)
Joel Haack (CNS)
Phyllis Baker (CSBS)
Sue Hill (CHFA)
Victoria DeFrancisco (CHFA)
Melissa Beall (CHFA)
Martie Reineke (CHFA)
Doug Shaw (CNS)

Have Expressed Some Interest (one communication)

Alan Schmitz (CHFA)
Carolyn Hildebrandt (CSBS)
Jennifer Waldron (COE)
Mary Beth Stalph (CSBS)
Michael Blackwell (Multicultural Center)
John Burtis (CHFA)
Ken Baughman (CHFA)
Drake Martin (Student Affairs)
Glenn Nelson (CNS)
Jerry Soneson (CHFA)

By College

Business Administration: 2
Education: 4
Humanities & Fine Arts: 10
Natural Sciences: 4
Social & Behavioral Sciences: 5
Other: 5

Teaching-Learning Consortium
(aka Teaching-Learning Center Advocacy Group)
April 3, 2006 Meeting Notes

Attendees: Melissa Heston, Marilyn Drury, Dale Cyphert, Jerry Smith, Jean Gerrath, Deb Deemer, Karen Agee, Phil Fass, Erica Duffy, Bev Kopper

Handouts/Attachments: 2006 Campus Conversation Summary; Agenda

Summary: Following introductions, a brief background report was given. Attendees were then invited to share their views regarding the re-establishment of a center. Comments emphasized identifying and developing existing resources among faculty, focusing on innovation and change in teaching, developing a central meeting space for faculty discussions or workshops related to teaching and learning, and promoting a scholarship of teaching. The possibility of seeking or accepting a formal Senate charge at this time was not supported by the group in attendance; rather the group indicated a preference to work on those activities of particular interest to consortium participants. It was noted that the East Gym space originally set aside to house a teaching-learning center remains available for center purposes.

Next Steps:

- An invitation to join the consortium will be sent to all faculty
- Print resources previously housed in the old center will be located, if still available
- A tour of the East Gym Space with Marilyn Drury will be arranged
- Faculty willing to lead brown bags sessions, book discussions, and workshops next academic year will be identified and encouraged in these activities (strictly on a volunteer basis)
- Work will begin on updating or redeveloping the old center website to reflect the activities of the Consortium, and provide access to electronic resources in collaboration with ITS
- Funding will be sought from the Provost's Office to support these activities
- At least one follow-up meeting will be held this semester (purpose: to confer on/add to/revise the next steps; identify leadership)

Leadership: At this time, the leadership position for this group remains open. Anyone interested in taking on this role should contact me as soon as possible. For the time being, I will continue to do the logistical work identified in the next steps above.

Next Meeting: Thursday, April 20, at 3:30, East Gym (Foyer of the ITTC East Main Entrance--entrance facing the Physics building)

- Tour of East Gym Space with Marilyn Drury
- Planning for Fall 2006 Consortium Activities